

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER**MAY 03 2007****PROPOSED AGENDA FOR TELEPHONE INTERVIEW**

Examiner Stevens - I have two items that I would like to discuss in a telephone interview:

First item

Referring to claim 1, Applicant claims a method of generating a simulation application for simulating an output of a real device based on a monitored communication between an end device and the real device during a communication sequence. When the real device is a web server and the end device is a computer browser and the communication between the web server and the computer browser are HTTP requests, the generated simulation application can be used to walk through screens encountered when selecting and purchasing a particular item through a web site. *See* the present specification, page 32, lines 1-3. None of the references disclose generating a simulation application for simulating an output of a real device based on a monitored communication between an end device and the real device during a communication sequence.

Referring to Sato, "test instructions" are input into both a simulator and a real device to respectively output a simulator output A and a real device output B. *See* FIG. 2A showing outputs A and B and col. 3, lines 30-35. Then, the outputs A and B are compared to identify any discrepancies. When the outputs A and B identical as expected, the process ends. When the results are not identical and a discrepancy is identified, the process moves to FIGS. 2B and 2C. In those FIGS 2B and 2C, Sato shows that different portions of the instructions used on the real device are inserted into the instructions used on the simulator to try to identify the portion of the instructions on the real device that is causing the discrepancy.

Page 3, 2nd paragraph of the Office Action takes the position that the feature "monitoring communication between an end device and the real device during a communication sequence" is allegedly disclosed in Sato col. 1, lines 64-67 and col. 2, lines 1-6. Referring to that cited section, Sato discloses producing the above described simulator output A and the real device output B and then comparing them to detect discrepancies. Comparing a simulator output to a

Docket No. 2705-701 Page 19 of 21 Application No. 09/904,982

real device output is not "monitoring communication between an end device and the real device during a communication sequence."

Even if comparing a simulator output to a real device output were monitoring communication between an end device and the real device during a communication sequence (which it is not), the simulator output is not based on a monitored communication between an end device and the real device during a communication sequence. Rather, the simulator output A is based on the "test instructions" that are input into the simulator. *See* col. 3, lines 30-35. Or the simulator output A is based on a portion of different test instructions that were used the real device to product output B. *See* col. 3, lines 49-54.

Further to everything described above, it is also noted that at least some of the proposed modifications to Sato that are apparently described in the Office Action disrupt the principal operation of Sato and are therefore invalid modifications (MPEP 2143.01 last section illustrates this point). The principal operation of Sato is to debug instructions used on a real device by comparing an output from the real device to a simulator output. *See* col. 2, lines 64-67. To the extent that some of the proposed modifications appear to adjust Sato for causing the simulator output to be identical to the real device output, Sato no longer functions to reveal bugs in the instructions used on the real device.

Second item

On the contingency that claim 1 is not to be allowable during the telephone interview, Applicant also wishes to discuss claim 21. Claim 21 has been put into independent form to illustrate that it spans over three pages of this document. Referring to 714.12 of the MPEP, it states:

Many of the difficulties encountered in the prosecution of patent applications after final rejection may be alleviated if each applicant includes, at the time of filing or no later than the first reply, claims varying from the broadest to which he or she believes he or she is entitled to the most detailed that he or she is willing to accept.

Given the above described differences between claim 1 and the closest reference, Applicant is hopeful that a notice of allowance will result. However, short of a notice of

and others would also be greatly appreciated. During the telephone interview, Applicant is prepared to discuss claim 21 and/or any other dependent claim selected by the Examiner.

Respectfully submitted,

MARGER JOHNSON & McCOLLOM, P.C.

Michael A. Cofield
Reg. No. 54,630

MARGER JOHNSON & McCOLLOM, P.C.
210 SW Morrison Street, Suite 400
Portland, OR 97204
503-222-3613
Customer No. 20575